

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/534,238	<b>Applicant(s)</b> FESENKO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> MARYAM MONSHIPOURI	<b>Art Unit</b> 1656	

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

 (1) MARYAM MONSHIPOURI.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

 (2) Janet Cord.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 29 April 2011
**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*112 first, 112second*

Claims discussed:

*37, 40, 42, 43-44, 62*

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

On 4/20/2011 the examiner called up Ms. Cord to request narrowing the scope of claim 37, by substituting the term "comprising" with "consisting of" in order to overcome 112 first and potential art rejections (see previous office actions). The examiner also requested bringing up the limitations of claim 62 into base claim 37 in order to overcome 112 second rejection directed to relative term "close". The examiner also asked about the status of withdrawn claims. On 4/22/2011 Ms. Cord called back the examiner and gave her authority to amend the claims as discussed and also cancel non-elected claims.

On 4/26/2011 the examiner called back Ms. Cord to inquire about the Markush claim 42, which had the phrase "dihydrolipoic acid" in the preamble but kept repeating said phrase in al elemnts c-e of the claim. She also suggested canceling elemenst a and c-d in claim 42, order to overcome art rejections. In response Ms. Cord on 4/27/2011 agreed with the propped changes to be incorporated into the Ex. amendment.

On 4/28/2011 the examiner called Ms. Cord one more time to ask for consistency in spelling of the phrase "Prx Vlhun", which appears to be misspelled in claims 40, 42, 43-44. She also mentioned that the dependency of claim 42 needs to be corrected because said claim now depends from claim 37, rather than claim 1.

On 4/29/2011 Ms. Cord called back the examiner to authorize correcting said claims as discussed in said Ex. amendment. On may 3<sup>rd</sup> 2011 the examiner called up applicant to let her now that a supplementatl 892 form sent on 1/4/2008 with correct dates for references cited is attache to this ex. amendmentd..

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)